



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,945	02/05/2002	Max Schireson	ORCL-2000-136-01	3623

7590 05/31/2006
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
CHEUNG, MARY DA ZHI WANG	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3621	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/071,945	Applicant(s) SCHIRESON, MAX	
	Examiner Mary Cheung	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on March 14, 2006. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claim 15 is amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed March 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant arguments that Bezos (U. S. Patent 6,029,141) fails to teach an item on the Web page is selected, edited and submitted, and then the Web page is updated, as claimed in the independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Examiner respectfully disagrees because this matter is taught by Bezos as the associate can freely modify the web page and updating information (i.e. product descriptions) on the web page (column 9 lines 5-21).

In response to the applicant's arguments that Dabney (U. S. Patent 6,643,663) fails to teach "editing the item on the Web page", examiner believes that the primary reference Bezos teaches this matter by allowing the associate to edit product information with the catalog/web page (column 9 lines 5-21).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine Immerman (U. S. Patent 6,785,721) with the teachings of Bezos and Dabney, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references

Art Unit: 3621

themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958

F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Immerman specifically

teaches the multiple levels of access control allows flexibility for controlling access to all or part of application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos et al., U. S. Patent 6,029,141 in view of Dabney et al., U. S. Patent 6,643,663.

As to claims 1, 8 and 15, Bezos teaches a method, an apparatus, and a computer readable media having computer readable instructions for implementing an e-commerce storefront management user interface to enable efficient updating of the Web pages of the storefront, comprising (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21):

- a) Accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21);
- b) Submitting log in information to the Web site (Appendix A of column 16 – column 17);

Art Unit: 3621

- c) Invoking a web page editor having a graphic user interface for editing the Web page (column 9 lines 5-21, 54-67 and Figs. 1-2);
- d) Selecting an item on the Web page to modify (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21);
- e) Editing the item on the Web page (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21 and column 11 lines 34-36 and Figs. 1-2, 5);
- f) Submitting the edited item to the Web site (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21);
- g) Receiving an updated version of the Web page to view (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21).

Bezos does not specifically teach verifying the edited item. However, Dabney teaches receiving an updated version of content and verify the edit item (column 5 lines 31-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow Bezos' teaching to include verifying the edited item as enunciated by Dabney for ensuring the quality of the edited item.

As to claims 2, 9 and 16, Bezos teaches logging into the Web site with an authentication to obtain privileges for modifying Web pages of the Web site (Appendix A of column 16 – column 17).

As to claims 3, 10 and 17, Bezos modified by Dabney teaches receiving updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edit item as discussed above. Bezos modified by Dabney does not specifically teach logging out the Web site prior to receiving the updated version of the Web page. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3621

ordinary skill in the art to allow the teaching of Bezos modified by Dabney to include the feature of logging out the Web site prior to receiving the updated version of the Web page for reducing the conflict between the modification and updating of the web content.

As to claims 4, 11 and 18, Bezos teaches the steps the management user interface is implemented with a web browser (column 9 lines 5-21, 54-67 and Figs. 1-2).

As to claims 5, 12 and 19, Bezos modified by Dabney teaches viewing the updated version of the Web page using a web browser on a client machine to verify the appearance of the edited item as discussed above (see claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15 and 18 above). Bezos modified by Dabney does not specifically teach the appearance being the same as the appearance to a standard user accessing the updated version of the Web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Bezos modified by Dabney to include the feature of verifying the verifying the appearance of the edited item being the same as the appearance to a standard user accessing the updated version of the Web page for ensuring the quality of the edited item.

As to claims 7, 14 and 21, Bezos does not specifically teach generating workflow notification to request an approval of the updated version of the Web page, wherein the updated version of the Web page is not provided until the approval is obtained.

However, this matter is taught by Dabney receiving the new edited content for approval and receiving a notification for the content being approved before dissemination (column 5 lines 31-43 and column 15 lines 26-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow Bezos' teaching to include the feature of generating workflow notification to request an approval of the

updated version of the Web page, wherein the updated version of the Web page is not provided until the approval is obtained as taught by Dabney for ensuring the quality of the edited content.

5. Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos et al., U. S. Patent 6,029,141 in view of Dabney et al., U. S. Patent 6,643,663 in further view of Immerman et al., U. S. Patent 6,785,721.

As to claims 6, 13 and 20, Bezos modified by Dabney teaches submitting log in information to Web page as discussed above. Bezos modified by Dabney does not specifically teach submitting a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web page and submitting a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web page, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level. However, this matter is taught by Immerman as an access control list that specifies the level of access users and servers, and the administrator can specify an access level, access level privileges for each user name and server name (column 19 line 66 – column 20 line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the teaching of Bezos modified by Dabney to include multiple privilege levels of access for securely controlling the content of the Web page.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Cheung whose telephone number is (571)-272-6705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 10:00 AM to 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached on (571) 272-6712.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3621

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceedings is assigned are as follows:

(571) 273-8300 (Official Communications; including After Final
Communications labeled "BOX AF")

(571) 273-6705 (Draft Communications)

Mary Cheung
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3621
May 24, 2006

MARY D. CHEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

